

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES



Mugar Memorial Library

Service Paper
Moore, R. F.
1947
STORED

Boston University
School of Education

Service Paper
An Evaluation of Individual Instruction
in Beginning Reading

Submitted by
Ruth F. Moore

In partial fulfillment of requirements for
the degree of Master of Education

1947

First Reader: Associate Professor, Helen A . Murphy

Second Reader: Dean, Donald D. Durrell

Boston University
School of Education
Library



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/evaluationofindi00moor>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	
Introduction	
I. Summary of Previous Research.....	1
II. Plan of Study.....	17
III. Analysis of Data.....	40
IV. Summary and Conclusions.....	54
Bibliography.....	58

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Helen Murphy, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for her cheerful assistance, guidance, and encouragement without which this study would never have been completed.

I wish, also, to express my appreciation to my Superintendent, Dr. Edwin Fuller, my Principal, Mr. Henry Tenney, the three elementary schools' principals and the four first grade teachers whose gracious coöperation made possible this study.

INTRODUCTION

It is a well known fact that children differ greatly in their capacity to learn to read and in their rate of learning, and that these differences increase rather than diminish as the reading program progresses. These differences must be met by the classroom teacher in some way. One way of caring for individual differences is through an individualized teaching program.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate such a program as it affects:

1. Reading achievement in Grade One
2. The number of books read
3. These same factors in relation to intelligence levels
4. Sex differences in achievement

CHAPTER I

Summary of Previous Research

"Pacing the progress of all pupils in one class by that of one group is the essence of regimented instruction against which our professional leaders have waged a ceaseless war."

1

Development of Individual Instruction

Though we are inclined to feel that individual instruction is a highly new and modern theory of American Education, actually it was the method used in our early colonial schools² but at this time it was a hit or miss method resultant from the one room school house. As school population grew and the graded schools developed, this individual instruction gave way to class instruction because it seemed to overcome much of the difficulty encountered by inadequately trained teachers in giving individual instruction to large groups. In organizing plans for instruction, little or no consideration was given to individual differences and needs.

-
1. E. A. Betts, Foundation of Reading Instruction, American Book Co., 1946, p. 54.
 2. R. B. Dean, "What Has Become of the Individual Instruction Movement of the 1920's and Early 1930's," School and Society, vol. 58, pp. 164-167, S. '43.

The emphasis was rather on subject matter to be taught at given grade levels and achievement in terms of class averages instead of individual development.

The development of the graded school system introduced a lockstep which has been a "constant peril in education."¹ An attempt to break this lockstep in education was made as early as 1867 when William T. Harris, Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis pointed out the evils of the class method and the annual mass promotion.

It was left, however, to such men as John Kennedy in Batavia, New York and Preston W. Search in Pueblo, Colorado to devise definite plans whereby a place was made for individual instruction within the school organization.

In 1895, John Kennedy instituted a plan in the Batavia, New York system in which the slow learner received individual instruction outside of the regular classroom by a special teacher in order to bring him up to his class level. Though this was strictly a remedial program, making no provision for the normal or bright child beyond the given class work, Kennedy is generally considered the pioneer in "emphasizing the vital importance of diagnosing the needs of individual pupils."²

1. Betts, Foundation of Reading Instruction, p. 35.

2. Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, Part II, "Adapting the School to Individual Differences," National Society for the Study of Education, Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1925, p. 33.

The time schedule of the Mt. Vernon, New York, elementary schools in which one hour a day was allowed the teacher to work with slow pupils in the classroom, while the rest were occupied in worthwhile class work was directly inspired by the Batavia plan. Here the classroom organization was kept intact. The time for individual instruction was provided for within the classroom.

Other provisions for the laggard were made under such plans as that in Gary, Indiana, where Superintendent William Wirt devised a scheme giving the slow learner double time. These early plans seemed to have been mainly concerned with bringing those behind class standards up to class level.

Attempts to take care of individual differences through ability-grouping were made by Courtis in Detroit and Sutherland in Los Angeles. However, these made no provisions for individual differences within the group and both men admitted this to be only a half way measure.

In 1888, Preston W. Search, then Superintendent of Schools in Pueblo, Colorado, initiated the chain of events which later developed into the widely publicized "Winnetka Plan." While in Pueblo (1888-94) Search organized and carried out an individual instruction program, the Pueblo Plan.² He later moved to California where he attempted to institute

1. Twenty Fourth Year Book, Part II, p. 39.

2. Betts, Foundation of Reading Instruction, p. 37.

a similar plan which was a failure from the point of view of organization. It was his inspiration, however, which led Dr. Frederic L. Burke in 1912 and 1913 at the San Francisco State Teachers College to set up the individual instruction program which was thwarted by interferences from the State. He was, therefore, never able to develop his plan in a public school situation. It was left to Carleton Washburne and Willard Beatty members of the faculty at the San Francisco State Teachers College, and interested in the project to carry it on to success when they were called to the public schools in Winnetka, Illinois.

While there were many more individual instruction plans organized and carried out between 1920 and the early 1930's, some of them only half way measures, it was the Winnetka Plan that became so well known because it was publicized through articles in leading educational magazines, through educational books, lectures, and summer sessions. The Winnetka Plan, like Burke's, was a true individual instruction plan. It considered all the pupils and incorporated the whole schools from Kindergarten through High School. Also much worth while statistical data was gathered from this experiment and made available to educators throughout the country. Betts in referring to this plan says: "Under the direction of Superintendent Washburne, a system of individualized instruction has been developed which overshadows

all other plans developed to date.¹

The Winnetka Plan, which is described at length in Carleton Washburne's book Adjusting the School to the Child,² was organized to provide two things: first, for individual instruction of common essentials, the mastery of which was necessary for each pupil; and second, for an activity program which would allow a child to discover and follow his interests and special abilities. Mastery in this field was not an aim.

Such a program necessitated the reorganization of the curriculum and general procedure, so that the common essentials were definitely listed, self-teaching aids in the various subjects devised, and a testing program set up. Likewise, a plan whereby each teacher ^{could} keep a record on individual progress of each child in each subject.

Beginning reading, which applies most directly to this paper, was probably the most difficult to set up because "The children come to school with no study habits and with none of the tools for learning that can be relied upon in later grades. Later, one can rely upon pupil skills in reading to make self-instruction possible."³

The beginning program⁴ for reading as operated in the

1. Betts, Foundation of Reading Instruction, p. 40.

2. Carleton Washburne, Adjusting the School to the Child, World Book Co., 1932.

3. Ibid., p. 68.

4. Ibid., pp. 68-75.

Winnetka Schools involved a good deal of building of stories and basic sight vocabulary by the teacher and children and the use of a system of self-teaching aids constructed by the teacher. Another plan without the use of such an elaborate system of self-teaching aids and the use of commercial reading material was described by Washburne as being quite as functional as that employed in the Winnetka System.

Under the Winnetka Plan, a first grade was divided into two groups, one with a mental age of six and a half and above, and the other with a mental age below six and a half. The children in the latter group were given advanced kindergarten work, but no reading until they had reached a mental age of approximately six and a half years. The first group was ready to start reading. This reading was approached through experience stories out of which was developed a basic sight vocabulary. Later the children read primer material based on the same sight vocabulary. A system of self-teaching aids was devised and constructed by the teacher whereby the children could work individually or in pairs on their sight vocabulary. In the very beginning there was group work, but as rapidly as possible the children were freed for individual work on their basic sight vocabulary and for independent reading in primers which made use of this vocabulary. This plan also involved a phonics program which was presented on an individualized basis at a point when a

basic sight vocabulary had been mastered. When the children were freed from group activity for independent or individual reading, the teacher, during the reading time, went among those studying silently, helping them with unknown words, hearing them read sections, assigning more advanced readers to work with those having difficulty, and keeping a record of progress on individual record cards.

Through the 1920's various plans to break the lock-step were devised and carried out which recognized individual differences and needs. Miss Parkhurst's famous Dalton Plan¹ was of this period. While it was largely a socialization plan, it was a definite attempt to take care of individual differences and needs of pupils.

At the same time individual instruction was receiving attention in England and on the Continent, such as the adaptation of the Dalton Plan² in the various schools³ in England and the Decroly Plan³ in Brussels.

The University of Chicago, which has occupied a leading position in the field of individual instruction, began extensive research on individual needs within the classroom during this decade from 1920-1930. The results showed that remedial cases could be prevented if more time was given to studying individual needs within the classroom.

1. Evelyn Dewey, The Dalton Laboratory Plan, E. P. Dutton, 1922
2. Helen Parkhurst, Education on the Dalton Plan, E. P. Dutton, 1922, pp. 269-278.
3. Amélie Hamaide, The Decroly Class, Dutton, 1924.

While this movement for individual instruction reached its zenith between 1920 and 1930 and seemed to give way to the activity program and project method which followed, it marked the beginning of wide interest and research in individual differences and brought to the fore the necessity for some school organization that would recognize and care for the wide range of individual differences among pupils even with similar intelligence and background. It also emphasized the need of teacher training along this line.

Thus we see that from 1868 through the 1920's and early 1930's various plans were set forth to differentiate instruction. These plans fall into two categories:

1. Attempts at adjustment without breaking up the basic class organization.
2. Provision for strictly individual progress in the common essentials, and with it, necessarily, much individual instruction.

Those falling into the first category are called by Washburne compromise plans. For he says, "Those subjects which we want each child to master must be 'individualized' --there is no other effective way of getting widely differing children to obtain a common standard."¹

Betts in his current book substantiated this statement in his quote from Reagan, "Group instruction, however, by no

1. Washburne, Adjusting the School to the Child, p. 2.

means proved to be an unalloyed blessing, and for several decades there has been a growing tendency to replace it, at least, in part by some form of individual instruction.¹"

Data and Conclusions From the Foregoing Studies

Experimentation in the field of individual differences in reading show how marked is the range of pupils not only in a class of twenty-five or thirty but within a group of bright, average, or slow learners. Such evidence shows clearly the need for some type of differentiated instruction and the inadequacies of class instruction.

While these findings apply to the use of an individual instruction program in any of the tool subjects, we can also apply them exclusively to the field of reading. Many of the investigations are based on results of testing and experimenting in the reading area. Those that have been used here have been selected as they apply to reading.

In the Detroit survey, the results proved conclusively that whether instruction is individualized or not children of each level of intelligence, as shown by scores in mental tests, have a very wide range of achievement and very different rates of progress in any specific skill. In one of these experiments based upon 116 first grade children, the results showed the time required by individual children to

1. Betts, Foundation of Reading Instruction, p. 36.

finish a series of lessons in reading. In group A, the time required to finish ranged from 15 to 53 days. In group B, the range was from 12 to 64 days and in group C, from 16 to 77. The total range was from 12 to 77 days. "The significant detail, however, is the range within each group. Neither the exceptional children nor any of the others form a homogenous group which learns at the same rate."¹

Further investigations in Los Angeles² by Sullivan, in Winnetka³ by Washburne, and in Iowa⁴ by Horn, substantiate these findings.

In San Francisco, where the data was compiled as results of ability-grouping the results show "that children do not bunch at any ability-level, but vary gradually from very fast to very slow; any attempt at ability-grouping would simply do what ordinary class instruction does on a larger scale,--waste the time of the quick child and force the slow child forward at a rate too fast for thoroughness."⁵

The University of Iowa further confirmed these findings. They pointed out a child's progress at the beginning does not insure or set the rate for the whole term. Only two children out of forty were found who could progress together with little or no waste of time.

1. Twenty-Fourth Year Book, Part II, p. 142.

2. Ibid., pp. 148-151.

3. Ibid., pp. 151-154.

4. Ibid., pp. 159-164.

5. Ibid., p. 165.

The Winnetka results found that, "Had the children been classified into ability groups, large numbers would have been held to standards above or below their ability" and that "Children of identical I. Q.'s may differ widely in progress."¹

Summary of This Data

It was concluded from the findings of these studies that first, children do not fall into natural ability groups; second, that groups which appear relatively homogeneous at the time of classification soon vary more within themselves than they do from each other; third, ability-grouping holds large numbers to standards above or below their ability; fourth, ability-grouping wastes the time of the quick child and forces the slow child forward at a rate too fast for thoroughness; fifth, pupils who make equal progress for given times do not hold to equal rates; and sixth, ability-grouping doesn't solve the problem of adjusting school to individual differences.

In judging the effectiveness of an individual instruction program both the results of the studies in Detroit and Winnetka indicated that efficiency in the tool subjects is definitely increased by individual instruction.

1. Ibid., p. 165.

Factors Which Cause Individual Differences in Beginning Reading

There is a wide range of difference among children in their ability to learn to read and their rate of learning. Factors which cause these differences are listed by Durrell¹ in the Thirty-Sixth Year Book as follows:

1. Intelligence
2. Physical Conditions
3. Sensory Capacities
4. Language Equipment
5. Rate of Learning
6. Response to Motivation
7. Sex Differences
8. Emotional Blockings
9. Attitudes

Studies of Individual Instruction With a Free Reading Program as the Core

Today in many schools, individual instruction programs are being carried on in reading at all grade levels. These fall into two groups. Those based exclusively on a free reading program without formal groups and those which have combined this free reading program with supplementary group activities.

1. The Thirty-Sixth Yearbook, Part I, "The Teaching of Reading," National Society for the Study of Education, Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1925, pp. 325-356.

¹
Harris says that "Free Reading does not provide a complete and well rounded reading program, but must be supplemented by other activities." He says the program should be divided into (1) individual instruction, which constitutes the free reading program; and (2) the group activities, which constitute mastery of a basic sight vocabulary and a word analysis program.

²
Boney and Leman in their article on "Individuality in Beginning Reading" reported on a reading program that was strictly "free reading" without formal groups and no supplementary activity. They found that "children who read a variety of pre-primers grow in reading better than those who stick to one series."

³
Dolch in describing a plan for Remedial Reading recommended a free reading program without formal groups, but supplemented by group activities, says "that children learn to read rapidly only when they read a great deal, and that the only way for them to read a great deal is for each to read to himself."

⁴
Kiesling reported on an Individual Instruction Plan

-
1. Albert J. Harris, How to Increase Reading Ability, Longmans, Green and Co., 1940, p. 368.
 2. Dewitt C. Boney, "Individuality in Beginning Reading," Education, vol. 59, 1938, pp. 17-20.
 3. E. W. Dolch, "Mass Remedial Reading," Educational Administration and Supervision, vol. 23, 1937, pp. 541-546.
 4. Lethal G. Kiesling, "Adapting Early Instruction to the Individual Child," Seventeenth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D. C., vol. XVIII, pp. 319-327.

which he carried out with Institution children. He says, "Learning to read is an individual job. Each child has his own peculiar interests, his own rate of mental development, a particular combination of physical characteristics, and a certain pattern of emotional attitudes. These factors affect his rate of learning, his method, his ability to concentrate, coöperate, and carry responsibility. It is necessary, therefore, to provide for much individualization in beginning reading."

His study showed a wide variation in abilities, needs, and accomplishments. For example, after eight months of instruction, there was a variance from 1.4 to 3.5 on standard tests results, and a great variance in number of books read. Some children read two pre-primers only, while one read a total of twenty-five books including eleven primers and two first readers,--a total range of from five to forty-four books read.

¹
Worlton in his experiment on individualized teaching in reading in Salt Lake City found that they were able to provide a "richer program of reading material" and "that children like it better" and that "children of all types have better opportunities to learn to read and to read to

1. J. T. Worlton, "Individualizing Instruction in Reading," Elementary School Journal, vol. 36, No. 10, June, 1936, pp. 735-747.

learn," and that "they read under the stimulus of a personal and vital motivation."

These studies all point out the individualized instruction is necessary because of the wide range of individual differences, that children like an individualized program better, that children who read widely tend to make more rapid progress than children who read a limited amount, and that an individual instruction program gives them this opportunity to read more widely.

¹
Zirbes made a study of extensive reading compared to class instruction and found this type of program was superior for children who were reading more than sixty words per minute, but that class instruction was better for children reading below this rate.

²
Field made a comprehensive study on the same basis of comparison and found no significant difference between these two types of instruction

Relation of Present Study to Previous Ones

This study relates to the previous ones in that it is a further experimentation in the field of individual in-

-
1. Laura Zirbes, Practice Exercises and Checks on Silent Reading in the Primary Grades, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.
 2. H. A. Field, Extensive Individual Reading versus Class Reading, Contributions to Education, No. 394, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1930.

struction in reading. The purpose is to valuate an individual instruction program for efficiency, scope of reading material, and sex differences.

CHAPTER II

Plan of Study

Purpose

The plan of this study is to evaluate an individual instruction program in reading in two first grade classes as compared with three first grade classes taught with the usual group procedure. The basis for comparison is first, reading achievement; second, number of books read; third, these same factors in relation to intelligence levels; and fourth, sex differences in achievement.

Plans

In the fall of 1946 at a primary teachers meeting, the writer talked over with the four other first grade teachers the plans for carrying out this experiment and solicited their coöperation. They were asked to keep a list of the books each child read during the year so that the writer might have these records at the close of school in June.

Selection of Population

The children for the experiment represented 132 pupils in five first grades from four different elementary schools

in the same community. They had comparable educational experience and home background and equivalent chronological and mental ages.

The experimental group represented 57 children in two classes of first graders with two different teachers in the same building. The boys in the group outnumbered the girls by 11.

The control group represented 75 children in three classes of first graders with three different teachers and in three different elementary schools. The boys and girls in this group were almost evenly matched--37 boys and 38 girls.

The range in chronological age as of October 1, 1946 for the experimental group was 5 years and 7 months. For the control group the range was from 5 years 5 months to 7 years. Table 1 shows the mean chronological ages.

Table 1
Chronological Age

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S.E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	57	6-4.5	2.98	.394	.20	.534	.377
Con.	75	6-4.3	3.20	.369			

This table shows a mean chronological age of 6 years and 4.5 months for the experimental group and 6 years and

4.13 months for the control group. There is no significant difference in chronological ages.

The range in mental age for the experimental group was from 6 years to 9 years 1 month. For the control group the range was from 6 years 1 month to 8 years 11 months. Table 2 shows the mean mental ages.

Table 2
Mental Age

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	57	7-9.0	7.18	.951	.80	1.29	.620
Con.	75	7-8.2	7.60	.877			

This table shows a mean mental age of 7 years 9.0 months for the experimental group and a mean of 7 years and 8.2 months for the control group. There is no significant difference in mental ages.

Description of Procedure for Individual Reading Instruction

Introduction

A year ago this spring two teachers visited schools where the first grade teachers were carrying on an individualized reading program without formal groups, the core of which was free reading supplemented by group activities. The

plan seemed to offer many advantages, so permission was asked to try it out in two first grade classrooms. In April 1946, after the reading had been taught in groups the previous part of the year, individual instruction without formal groups was begun. Since the term was well advanced, it necessitated giving each child free choice in selecting his next book, allowing him to progress according to his own rate and interest. The plan seemed to fall into a pattern so easily and the progress appeared so marked that it was felt it would be well worth trying the next year on an adequately planned basis. In September, 1946, the reading program in these two classes was organized on an individualized basis without formal reading groups, but with supplementary group activities.

Initial Stage

The plan in its initial stage was not completely individualized. The reason for this was twofold: first, "children enter first grade with no study habits, and second, children enter with none of the tools for learning that can be relied upon in later grades or the latter part of the first grade." ¹ Therefore self-instruction is impossible until sufficient sight vocabulary is developed so a child can work alone profitably.

1. Carleton Washburne, Adjusting the School to the Child, p. 68.

Although the delaying of individualized instruction until a basic sight vocabulary has been established seems more practical and is generally agreed to be from the point of view of most educators, Dr. Boney¹ has been successful in carrying out a program of free reading from the very beginning of first grade.

In September reading was approached through a readiness program, which consisted of activities, conferences, and experience stories, the purpose largely being to arouse interest in reading, to show the need of it, to give the habit of left to right eye movement, and to develop language ability. Paralleling this program, the children were given training in auditory and visual discrimination using as a guide² Building Word Power, by Murphy, Durrell, and Sullivan. This was done both with the whole class and in groups.

The next step was to organize the class into reading groups. This was done in about three weeks' time. At the start there were three reading groups³ and the material for the Scott Foresman Pre-Primers, We Look and See, We Work and Play, and We Come and Go was presented. The procedure

1. Dewitt C. Boney, and Edna Leman, Individuality in Beginning vol. 59, 1938, pp. 17-20.
2. D. D. Durrell, H. B. Sullivan, H. A. Murphy, Building Word Power, World Book Co., 1945.
3. William S. Gray, D. Baruch, E. R. Montgomery, We Look and See, We Work and Play, We Come and Go, Scott, Foresman Co., 1941.

1

as recommended in the manual was followed. The purpose in using these books was to have some definite basic sight vocabulary.

As soon as the preparatory lessons were over and the children were ready to go into the Pre-Primers, the teacher began to hear them read the books individually and to use a system of filing cards to check individual progress.

All the preparatory board work and all the word practice at this time was done in groups but the book reading was done individually from the beginning. Gradually the children were eliminated from group work and placed on an individual basis and on the free reading program. The faster learners, of course, were the first to be excused from the preparatory work at the board. This was a gradual process with the preparatory work becoming less and less frequent until it was eliminated entirely. The slower learners worked in groups for longer time, some up through December; and throughout the entire year, children came to work in groups for practice in special difficulties that became evident from the needs that would arise in reading and which were recorded on the progress cards.

Generally speaking, after the initial amount of group

1. William Gray and Marion Monroe, Guidebook, for the Pre-Primer Program of the Basic Readers, Scott, Foresman Co., 1941.

work to establish the sight vocabulary which is found in the Scott Foresman Pre-Primers the children learned to read by reading.

Free Selection of Books

The program was based on a free selection of books. All children were required to read We Look and See, We Work¹ and Play and We Come and Go. Having finished these, they were allowed a free choice from then on. They made this selection from the bookcase in the class room where there was a large assortment of reading books of pre-primer, primer, and first grade level books. To supplement this, were added, as the year progressed, books on a second grade level and beyond. Some of the exceptional readers went to the school library for their selections or into the second grade room to ask to borrow books. This was necessary in only a few cases because our own library was sufficiently good to satisfy the needs of the large majority of the class.

In ordering books for such a reading program, it should be noted that two or three copies of a variety of readers were requested rather than sets.

While as a rule the child made his own selection by himself, if he made a selection that was too difficult or too

1. Gray, Baruch and Montgomery, We Look and See, We Work and Play, We Come and Go, 1941.

easy, he was assisted in his choice by the teacher. In the case of a too difficult book, the teacher would usually give the child a chance to find it out for himself by letting him start to read the book and then go with him to the bookcase and point out the group of books that would be on his reading level. If the book was too easy for reading growth, the teacher would say, "You may read it in your spare time or take it home but let's find something harder to read in school." Most of the children were proud when they could get a harder book so it was an easy situation to handle. As a rule, the children made good selections from the first and pretty much at the right level.

Procedure for Individual Instruction

With the knowledge of the classroom organization in its initial stage, we are ready to go on to the procedure for the individualized work which is the core of this program.

The technique for checking progress and the method for handling the classroom procedure was based on a system of filing cards. The teacher had a card for each child with his name at the top and space to record his achievement in reading and the related fields. The name of the book a particular child was reading was put down on the card, beside the name of the book was a page number in pencil. This number

was erased after each reading time and the new page number recorded. When the book was completed, a check was placed beside the book and the name of the new selection added to the list. Also on this card were listed reading work books, progress in auditory discrimination, home books, and any special needs that showed up during the reading time.

Name

- ✓ We Look & See 'Let's Get Started
- ✓ We Work & Play (need word practice)
- ✓ We Come & Go & Wk. Bk ✓ Fun with Dick and Jane
- ✓ Rides & Slides (needs word practice) +
- ✓ Here & There

needs to review beginning sounds

$\check{g}, \check{h}, \check{m}, \check{b}, \check{c}, \check{l}, \check{p}, \check{d}$

The time allotted for reading on the daily time schedule was about one hour and a half. This does not mean that every child spent this amount of time reading. It rather means that this was the time allotted by the teacher to check the reading with the children.

When the reading time began, the teacher selected a group of children to come to the reading corner by calling a list of names from her index card,--usually about six. These children came with their reading books which by the

nature of the technique were all different and might represent different levels of reading. Anne might be reading ¹Off We Go; Tom, ²Jim and Judy, and Peter, ³Our New Friends. The children sat down and first the teacher checked their places in these books with them. "Can you find your place and tell me the page number?" she might ask. Most of the youngsters were able to do this. If not, the teacher referred to her cards on which were recorded the books the children were reading and the page numbers, as previously described.

The checking of places was important at first because some youngsters had a tendency to skip stories or an inadequate idea of what it meant to read a book. To some children it meant looking the book through, reading a page now and then to the teacher, and having the book checked off. This type of child needed to be made conscious of the fact that he must read the whole book. If a book was too difficult, the child selected an easier one; or if he did not find the selection interesting, he made another choice, but once the level of difficulty and interest have been established, he had to read the whole book and check it with his teacher.

1. A. I. Gates, M. B. Huber, C. C. Peardon, Off We Go, Macmillan, 1939.
2. Gates, Huber and Peardon, Jim and Judy, Macmillan, 1941.
3. W. S. Gray, and M. H. Arbuthnot, Our New Friends, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1940.

Tim was the most pronounced case of opening his book to any page that suited his fancy or appearing with a new one quite convinced that he had finished his other one. He was an easy-going, phlegmatic child with a good sense of humor and an acute mind which he evidently was afraid of wearing out so he was careful not to overwork it. He had the ability of talking himself out of a good deal. At least he would always try and was frequently amused when the teacher made it plain that she saw through his excuses. He loved praise and reacted, at least temporarily, to it. Since his main aim was to get everything done in the easiest possible way and with the least amount of effort on his part, he persisted in opening a book to any place he chose and assuring the teacher that was the right place. He would have finished any book in two days according to his methods. He never did develop into a fluent reader, but he learned to stick to one thing and do it thoroughly before going on to the next. At first, he would always be two or three chapters ahead of where he had left off the day before when he came to tell his place. It required constant questioning for comprehension and an oral check on reading to convince him that he neither knew what the story was about or all the words. He finally learned and was quite proud of himself when he had his book opened to the page recorded on his progress card.

After the children had thus checked their places with the teacher, they were then told to study. They eventually came up, opened their books, and started to study without so many directions. Studying meant silent reading of one or more stories depending on the time element and the child's ability to read. During this study time, if a child came upon an unknown word which he could not figure out himself by the methods he had been taught, he came quietly up to the teacher and asked the word. To eliminate or minimize conversation, he merely pointed to the word and the teacher either told him or helped him to get it by himself. If, however, she was busy helping another child, the children always had permission to ask aid from their classmates. They soon learned who were the ones capable of assisting them. In soliciting pupil help, they followed the same procedure--pointing to the unknown word and the pupil teacher either told the word or nodded his head that he did not know either.

As soon as a child in the reading corner had read a story silently, he moved up into the chair beside the teacher. The next step followed one of two courses and sometimes both. Usually, the child told first what had happened in the story he read and then the teacher questioned him. The extent of questioning depended on the child. Some children showed right away that they had read the

story and understood what they read. This meant a minimum of time was spent questioning. Others who were not so sure of themselves needed more detailed questioning. Sometimes it was necessary to send a child back into the group and tell him to study again to find out what happened to Jim or what Sally did that made the family laugh. Sometimes it was necessary to work with the child to help him find the answer.

After the teacher was satisfied that a child understood what he had read silently, he then read orally. The amount, the selection, and extent varied depending on the child's progress in reading. At the first of the year the children read almost their whole story orally. This decreased as the year went on until toward the end some of the good readers checked their comprehension of a whole book with the teacher through the method described above and would select only one small part to read orally. Some of the home books were checked only by the telling and questioning method.

When the first six children had studied and checked their stories with the teacher, six more names were called from the progress cards and the same procedure was repeated with the next lot. This number six was not fixed. It is merely used to show that only a few children came to the reading corner at a time. Sometimes as one left, another

child was called to take his place and then again some eager youngster would come before he was called if he saw an empty chair. There was no objection to this. In fact, it was encouraged.

In a group of thirty children, no one teacher in an hour and a half can hear every child read every day. At least half of the class read daily and various methods were devised by which every child had some reading experience daily.

Further Reading Experiences

1. Silent Independent Reading

First, the children were encouraged to read their books at their seats silently in their spare time. They were encouraged to help each other and even listen to each other read. Some children needed more oral reading than the teacher had time to give them. After Johnny had checked his story with the teacher she might say, "Now you may read with Nancy if you wish. Go out and sit in the Assembly Hall." The Assembly Hall was used a great deal because many children reading orally in a room created too much noise and confusion. Frequently, four children, two readers and two pupil-teachers were sent to the Assembly Hall. The cloak room and all four corners of the room were also used for reading in pairs.

2. "Home" Books

Then there were what were called home books. When a child asked "May I take my book home?" as some frequently did, he was told by his teacher "You may borrow another book to read at home. Go to the bookcase and find something you think you would like to read. Then bring it to me and I will write it down on your card." When the child brought the book back to school, it was checked for comprehension in the same manner as a book read at school, and it was checked off on his card in the same way as a school book.

About 75 per cent of the class took books home eventually... It was encouraged, but never urged. The home books were always a selection that would involve a minimum of new vocabulary. Likewise, the children were encouraged to bring books to school from their own libraries to read. These books were recorded on the index cards and if satisfactorily read checked off.

A method used to check library or home books was through audience reading. Every so often a time was set aside when the children could tell the class about a book they had read outside and make a selection to read orally. It was necessary to be most tactful when such a period occurred as only the fluent readers should participate in

such an activity, otherwise, the listening youngsters would become restless and the value of such a situation lost. It frequently happened that some of the more fluent readers would find information to contribute to a science or social studies lesson. Such material they read orally to the class as a whole.

3. Coöperative Stories

Another device whereby the children experienced a reading situation was through the coöperative stories made in news period, in social studies, or about trips, or science experiences. These stories were made as the occasion arose, written on large lined chart paper, as dictated by the children to the teacher. Such stories were fairly frequent in the early part of the year and while they spread farther apart as the year advanced, still were made throughout the whole year.

4. Writing Stories

A reading situation which occurred in the latter half of the year was the stories the children built and wrote themselves. As they became sufficiently skilled in manuscript writing, they started making short two or three sentence stories first together and then individually. For instance, when one of the youngsters brought four polliwogs

to school, the children wrote stories. After having a class discussion, the children thought to themselves about what they would like to say. Two or three would tell their stories orally, simply to inspire the slower thinkers. Then a list of words which the children dictated to the teacher was put on the blackboard for use in writing the stories. The list might read:

Polliwog	Spring	Water	School	Brook
Swim	Gary	Legs	Brought	
Tail	Grow	Frog	Four	

After this initial period of help, the children worked independently. If further words were needed, they used their reading books as reference or if this did not answer their purpose, they simply put down the first letter and then a dash. These stories were written independently during the reading time and checked after the period was over, and, frequently, copied at a later period after the corrections had been made. After completion, the stories were read to the teacher or to the class as a whole, depending on the time element and the plans for the day.

Thus, you can see that there were many other reading situations which made it possible for the children to have reading experience other than that done in the regular

reading time. There were the silent independent reading, the oral reading done in pairs, the coöperative experience stories, the home books, and the independent written stories. These situations also made it possible to tie the reading up with meaningful situations and consequently made the entire program more purposeful.

Beyond this, a plan was worked out whereby in good weather the two first-grade teachers took turns going out on the play-ground thus relieving the other for additional reading time with youngsters who most needed it. It meant the reading time was lengthened without tying down the whole class to quiet work which is so difficult and much of a strain on the squirming, restless six year old. This, of course, would only be possible in a building which had two classes of a grade.

Word Analysis Program

Previously, I have referred to the children as helping themselves to sound a word. Their ability to do this was limited by their training in word analysis. We did have a definite program for this, and such a program, comes under the heading of the supplementary activities that are referred to when we speak of free reading with supplementary group activities. Some of this by nature of individual differences among the children in auditory acuity falls

into individualized training, and small group work. Particularly did this happen as the year wore on.

Under the word analysis program, the children were, from the very beginning of the year, given training in auditory and visual discrimination using as a guide Building¹ Word Power. With this training as a background, they learned the following method for attacking unknown words:

- a. Look at the beginning letter
- b. Look at the ending letter
- c. Look for endings (ing, s, ed, ly)
- d. Look for little words within words (and, in, it, at etc.)
- e. Read ahead and put in a word that makes sense. Be sure it begins and ends with the letters you see.

By this method the children were able to figure out many unknown words on their own. If they came to the teacher for assistance, she helped them to get the word themselves by the above method or by saying "This word rhymes with may. What does it begin with? 's' Yes, What is the word then? Say."

As a last resort the teacher told them the word. When a child asked help from one of his classmates, the pupil

1. Durrell, Sullivan and Murphy, Building Word Power.

teacher simply told the word. Occasionally some of the more advanced readers were able to help others to help themselves.

Other Activities During Reading Time

Likely, one of the biggest problems and one of the first questions a first grade teacher will ask is: "What do you do with the rest of the class when you are listening to one child read?" It is more of a problem at first, but decreases as the child's reading ability increases and he begins to establish work habits. The activities the children carry on when not working in the reading corner are:

1. Drawing or painting on paper
2. Use of large blackboard space for same
3. Number experiences
4. Science experiences
5. Blocks for building
6. Educational games and puzzles
7. Writing (independent stories as described)
8. Workbooks. (Both reading and number)
9. Construction and handwork and use of same
10. Silent independent reading
11. Looking at picturebooks

12. Scrap books.

13. Building picture word charts for word analysis program

Plan of Typical Daily Procedure During Reading Time

Independent work during hour of reading time. Morning.

1. Children work independently on number experiences.

Ex. Building number concepts with pictures:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sail} & + & \text{Sail} & \text{Sail} & = & 3 & 1 + 2 = 3 \\ \text{Sail} & & \text{Sail} & \text{Sail} & = & 2 & 3 + 1 = 2 \end{array}$$

Do extra number work. This means anything a child wants or needs to practice. It might be practice in writing certain numbers or building more picture stories, or counting.

2. Work independently on reading work books.

3. Study reading books silently. (Some children come to reading corner ready to work with teacher.)

When assigned work is completed, a choice is made independently of one of the following activities:

1. Use of blackboard for drawing, number work, or writing.
2. Paper available on table for drawing.
3. Equipment at easel sufficient for one child.
4. Games and Puzzles available on table for use.

5. Blocks in box on floor in corner of room.

6. Picture and scrap books available on table.

Children come as called or when ready, to reading corner for work with teacher, as previously described.

Independent work during hour of reading time. Afternoon. ¹

1. Class makes birthday cards for Johnny who is seven today.
2. Independent selection of available activities in room.

Morning

Independent Work

1. Writing stories independently about Science experience.
2. Workbooks
3. Choice of available activities.

Afternoon

1. Copy corrected stories.
2. Choice of available activities.

Morning

Independent Work

1. Find and cut out pictures from magazines of words beginning with the letter "f". Save to paste on chart.
2. Choice of available activities.

Afternoon

1. Workbooks.
2. Choice of available activities.

1. Afternoon reading only occurred in the latter half of the year and was not necessarily a daily procedure.

Testing Program

Intelligence Test

The intelligence of the children was measured by the Stanford-Binet¹ test which was given to each first grade child by the school psychologist. The results of the tests were filed in the Principal's Office at each of the elementary schools.

Reading Test

The reading achievement was measured by the Gates Primary Reading Test, Type 1, 2, and 3² administered to the five first grades by the writer in April 1947. Type 1 tested word recognition; type 2, sentence reading; and type 3, paragraph reading.

-
1. Lewis M. Terman, and Maud A. Merrill, Revised Stanford-Binet Tests of Intelligence, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1937.
 2. Arthur I. Gates, Gates Primary Reading Tests, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

CHAPTER III

Analysis of Data

The data was analyzed to compare:

1. Reading achievement
2. The number of books read
3. These same factors in relation to intelligence levels
4. Sex differences in reading achievement

Table 3 shows the mean reading achievement on type 1 of the Gates Test.

Table 3
Mean Achievement, Type 1

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C.R.
Exp.	57	22.35	13.56	1.79	4.79	2.35	2.04
Con.	75	17.56	12.84	1.49			

This table shows a mean reading score of 22.35 for the experimental group compared with 17.56 for the control group. The critical ratio of 2.04 shows this is not statistically

significant. There are 96 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 4 shows the mean achievement on the Gates Test, type 2.

Table 4
Mean Achievement, Type 2

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	57	21.22	11.79	1.56	2.13	1.97	1.08
Con.	75	19.09	10.44	1.20			

This table shows a mean reading score of 21.22 for the experimental group compared with 19.09 for the control group. The critical ration of 1.08 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 72 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 5 shows the mean achievement on the Gates Test, type 3.

Table 5
Mean Achievement, Type 3

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	57	11.16	7.22	.956	.34	3.94	.084
Con.	75	10.82	6.92	.799			

This table shows a mean reading score of 11.16 for the experimental group compared with 10.82 for the control group. The critical ratio of .084 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 6 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 6 shows the mean number of Pre-Primers read.

Table 6
Mean Number of Pre-Primers Read

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M	Diff. M	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
	1						
Exp.	53	4.75	1.74	.25	1.94	.438	4.45
Con.	75	6.59	3.13	.36			

This table shows the mean number of pre-primers read is 4.75 for the experimental group compared with 6.59 for the control group. The critical ratio of 4.45 is statistically significant and favors the control group.

Table 7 shows the mean number of Primers read.

1. The number for the experimental group shows a difference at this point due to withdrawals and new entrances during the year. The withdrawals were not considered in final data. All children on the register in April 1947 were counted in the experiment.

Table 7

Mean Number of Primers Read

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	55	2.84	4.85	6.53	.06	.71	.084
Con.	75	2.78	2.60	.300			

This table shows the mean number of primers read is 2.84 for the experimental group compared with 2.74 for the control group. The critical ratio of .084 is not statistically significant. There are 6 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 8 shows the mean number of First Readers and beyond read.

Table 8

Mean Number of First Readers and Beyond Read

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	57	2.97	4.18	.555	1.33	.339	3.62
Con.	75	1.64	1.53	.176			

This table shows the mean number of first readers and beyond read is 2.97 for the experimental group and 1.64 for the control group. The critical ratio of 3.62 shows this is statistically significant in favor of the experimental group.

Table 9 shows the mean achievement made by the children with I. Q.'s of 120 and above on the Gates Test, type 1.

Table 9

Mean Achievement at I. Q. Level 120 & Above

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	35	27.31	12.23	2.23	3.97	2.81	1.41
Con.	44	23.34	11.43	1.72			

This table shows a mean reading score of 27.31 for the experimental group compared with 23.34 for the control group. The critical ratio of 1.41 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 84 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 10 shows the mean reading achievement made by the children with I.Q.'s of 120 and above on the Gates Test, type 2.

Table 10

Mean Achievement at I.Q. Level 120 & Above

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	35	25.09	12.09	2.04	1.11	2.53	.438
Con.	44	23.98	9.99	1.50			

This table shows a mean reading score of 25.09 for the experimental group compared with 23.98 for the control group. The critical ratio of .438 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 34 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 11 shows the mean reading achievement made by the children with I. Q.'s of 120 and above on the Gates Test, Type 3.

Table 11

Mean Achievement at I. Q. Level 120 and Above

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	35	13.20	7.68	1.29	.68	1.63	.417
Con.	44	13.88	6.72	1.01			

This table shows a mean reading score of 13.20 for the experimental group compared with 13.88 for the control group. The critical ratio of .417 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 32 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the control group.

Table 12 shows the mean achievement made by the children with I. Q.'s between 110 and 120 on the Gates Test, Type 1.

Table 12

Mean Achievement at I. Q. Level 110-120

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	9	15.64	11.07	3.69	6.00	4.12	1.45
Con.	24	9.64	9.09	1.89			

This table shows a mean reading score of 15.64 for the experimental group compared with 9.64 for the control group. The critical ratio of 1.45 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 86 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 13 shows the mean achievement made by the children with I.Q.'s between 110 and 120 on the Gates Test, Type 2.

Table 13

Mean Achievement at I. Q. Level 110-120

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	9	14.98	7.49	2.49	1.86	2.85	.652
Con.	24	13.12	6.78	1.39			

This table shows a mean reading score of 14.98 for the experimental group compared with 13.12 for the control group. The critical ratio of .652 shows this is not statistically

significant. There are 48 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 14 shows the mean achievement made by the children with I. Q.'s between 110 and 120 on the Gates Test, Type 3.

Table 14

Mean Achievement at I. Q. Level 110-120

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	9	8.76	6.28	2.09	1.44	2.36	.610
Con.	24	7.32	5.46	1.11			

This table shows a mean reading score of 8.76 for the experimental group compared with 7.32 for the control group. The critical ratio of .610 is not statistically significant, There are 45 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

The number of children below the I. Q. level of a 110 was not sufficient to warrant analyzing the data at the 90 to 110 intelligence level.

Table 15 shows the mean number of first readers and beyond read by the children with I. Q. of 120 and above.

Table 15

Mean Number of First Readers and Beyond

(I. Q. level 120 and above)

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	35	6.33	4.33	.734	3.83	.786	4.87
Con.	44	2.50	1.86	.280			

This table shows the mean number of books read is 6.33 for the experimental group compared with 2.50 for the control group. The critical ratio of 4.87 shows the difference is statistically significant in favor of the experimental group.

Table 16 shows the mean number of first readers and beyond read by the children with I. Q.'s between 110 and 120.

Table 16

Mean Number of First Readers and Beyond

(I. Q. Level 110-120)

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	9	.89	1.08	.36	.14	.432	.324
Con.	24	.75	1.12	.24			

This table shows the mean number of books read is .89 for the experimental group and .75 for the control group. The critical ratio of .324 shows this is not statistically significant. There are 25 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 17 shows the mean reading achievement for the boys on the Gates Test, Type 1.

Table 17
Mean Achievement--Boys

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	34	18.55	12.2	2.09	3.69	2.70	1.37
Con.	37	14.86	10.5	1.72			

This table shows a mean reading score of 18.55 for the experimental group compared with 14.86 for the control group. The critical ratio of 1.37 shows this difference is not statistically significant. There are 82 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 18 shows the mean reading achievement for the boys on the Gates Test, Type 2.

Table 18

Mean Achievement--Boys

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	34	18.13	11.46	1.96	2.05	2.46	.833
Con.	37	16.08	9.14	1.50			

This table shows a mean reading score of 18.13 for the experimental group compared with 16.08 for the control group. The critical ratio of 1.37 shows the difference is not statistically significant. There are 70 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 19 shows the mean reading achievement for the boys on the Gates Test, Type 2.

Table 19

Mean Achievement--Boys

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	34	9.24	6.64	1.14	.35	1.55	.225
Con.	37	9.59	6.50	1.06			

This table shows a mean reading score of 9.24 for the experimental group compared with 9.59 for the control group.

The critical ratio of $-.225$ shows the difference is not statistically significant. There are 18 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the control group.

Table 20 shows the mean reading achievement for the girls on the Gates Test, Type 1.

Table 20

Mean Achievement--Girls

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	23	28.24	12.84	2.67	4.50	3.31	1.36
Con.	38	23.74	12.24	1.97			

This table shows a mean reading score of 28.24 for the experimental group compared with 23.74 for the control group. The critical ratio, 1.36 shows the difference is not statistically significant. There are 82 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 21 shows the mean reading achievement for the girls on the Gates Test, Type 2.

Table 21
Mean Achievement--Girls

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	23	26.18	8.91	1.85	3.70	2.54	1.45
Con.	38	22.48	10.77	1.74			

This table shows a mean reading score of 26.18 for the experimental group compared with 22.48 for the control group. The critical ratio of 1.45 shows this difference is not statistically significant. There are 84 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 22 shows the mean reading achievement for the girls on the Gates Test, Type 3.

Table 22
Mean Achievement--Girls

Group	No.	Mean	S. D.	S. E. M.	Diff. M.	S. E. Diff.	C. R.
Exp.	23	13.74	7.70	1.60	.32	1.97	.161
Con.	38	13.42	7.12	1.15			

This table shows a mean reading score of 13.74 for the experimental group compared with 13.42 for the control group. The critical ratio of .161 shows this difference is not statistically significant. There are 12 chances in 100 that it is a true difference in favor of the experimental group.

CHAPTER IV

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate an individual instruction program in reading at first grade level.

The experimental group consisted of 57 children in two first grade classes with two different teachers. These children were given an individual instruction program in reading the core of which was free reading without formal groups, but with supplementary group activities. After a short initial period of group work, the children were freed for independent and individualized reading. They were allowed to progress at their own rate of speed with free choice in the selection of books. The teacher during the reading time spent a few minutes with each child discussing the story, helping with unknown words and listening to oral reading.

The control group consisted of 75 children in three first grade classes with three different teachers. The children had similar backgrounds, comparable educational experience, and, approximately, the same chronological

and mental ages as the experimental group. These children were taught reading by the usual group method.

In order to evaluate this individualized program, it was necessary to have certain information for each child included in the experiment. The necessary data consisted of first, the chronological ages; second, the mental ages and intelligence quotients; third, the scores on a standardized reading test; and fourth, a list of the books read by each child. The mental ages and intelligence quotients were obtained from the office records where ^{they} were filed by the school psychologist, the results of the Stanford Binet test, which she administered to each first grade pupil. The scores on a standardized reading test were obtained from the results of the Gates Primary Reading Test, Types 1, 2 and 3, administered by the writer, in April, to the five first grades. The list of books read during the year were recorded by each of the first grade teachers and given to the writer along with the birth dates for each child.

Limitations of Study

The results on the Gates test show the greatest difference on the word recognition test, less on the sentence reading and least on the paragraph reading. This gradation of difference might be attributed to the possibility that under the individual teaching program, each child had an

opportunity to learn more thoroughly as he went along. The element of guessing, which is quite possible on the paragraph reading test, may have affected these scores.

The means on the Pre-Primers read showed a significant difference favoring the control group. At first grade level and beyond, the difference was significant in favor of the experimental group. It may be that the children taught under the individual method eventually out-read the children taught under the group method because they had more opportunity to progress at their own rate of speed.

It may be that children under the individual instruction program read more because their interest in reading was better stimulated by this method.

Individual instruction in reading may present more opportunity for the slow learner to progress at his own rate of speed, to master as he goes along, and to learn by methods which best suit his needs. It may be that individual instruction affords more opportunity for the child who enters late or transfers from another school to adjust more quickly and for the teacher to find more easily his academic level and needs.

Conclusions

1. It may be concluded from the data presented that individual instruction tends to be more efficient than group instruction "in any population in which the present group might constitute a representative sample."
1
2. The reading achievement showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups on any phase of the test. The differences, however, favored the experimental group each time.
3. At Pre-Primer level, the control group read more than the experimental group. The critical ratio showed this difference to be significant.
4. On the number of first-readers and beyond read, the difference was significant in favor of the experimental group.
5. When comparisons were made according to I. Q. levels, there were no significant differences except in the mean number of first readers and beyond and this difference was statistically significant in favor of the experimental group I. Q. level of 120 or above.
6. The analysis showed no statistically significant difference in achievement in boys and girls.

1. James E. Wert, Educational Statistics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1938, p. 141.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Betts, Emmett A., Foundation of Reading Instruction, New York, American Book Co., 1946.

_____, "Differentiated Instruction in Reading Activities", The American School Board, May and June, 1940, pp. 27-29, 29-30, 108.

Boney, Dewitt C., and Leman, Edna, "Individuality in Beginning Reading", Education, vol. 59, 1938, pp. 17-20.

Dean, R. B., "What Has Become of the Individual Instruction Movement of the 1920's and Early 1930's", School and Society, vol. 58, 1943, pp. 164-7.

Dewey, Evelyn, The Dalton Laboratory Plan, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922.

Dolch, E. W., "Mass Remedial Reading", Educational Administration and Supervision, vol. 23, 1937, pp. 541-546.

Durrell, D. D., Sullivan, H. B., Murphy, H. A., Building Word Power, New York, World Book Co. 1941.

Field, H. A., "Extensive Individual Reading versus Class Reading", Contribution to Education, No. 394, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1930.

Gates, A. I., Huber, M. B., Peardon, C. C., Jim and Judy, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1941.

_____, Off We Go, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1939.

Gray, William S., and others, Guidebook for the Pre-Primer Program of the Basic Readers, New York, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1941.

Gray, W. S., Baruck, D., Montgomery, E. R., We Look and See, New York, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1940.

_____, We Work and Play, New York, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1940.

_____, We Come and Go, New York, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1940.

Bibliography [Cont.] -2-

Gray, W. S., and Arbuthnot, M. H., Our New Friends, New York, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1940.

Hamaide, Amélie, The Decroly Class, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1924.

Harris, Albert J., How to Increase Reading Ability, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1940.

Kiesling, Lethal G., "Adapting Early Instruction to the Individual Child", Washington, D. C., Seventeenth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, vol. xviii, pp. 319-327.

Parkhurst, Helen, Education on the Dalton Plan, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922.

The Twenty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, "Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences," Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Co., 1936.

The Thirty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, "The Teaching of Reading," Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Co., 1937.

Washburne, Carleton, Adjusting the School to the Child, New York, World Book Co., 1932.

_____, A Living Philosophy of Education, New York, John Day Co., 1940.

Wert, James E., Educational Statistics, New York and London, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1938.

Worlton, J. T., "Individualizing Instruction in Reading," Elementary School Journal, vol. 36, No. 10, June, 1936, pp. 735-747.

Zirbes, Laura, Practice Exercises and Checks on Silent Reading in the Primary Grades, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY



1 1719 02554 5726

**B. U. Libraries
Not to be
taken from this room**

